

SHAWN R. PARR (State Bar No. 206616)
SUJATA REUTER (State Bar No. 232148)
PARR LAW GROUP
150 Almaden Blvd., Ste. 1380
San Jose, CA 95113
Telephone: (408) 267-4500
Facsimile: (408) 267-4535

Attorneys for Plaintiffs
VALENTINA SOLOVIEVA and NATALIA LITCHEV

CYNTHIA L. MELLEMA (State Bar No. 122798)
DAVID S. SIMONTON (State Bar No. 199919)
KIMBERLY E. DE HOPE (State Bar No. 215217)
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
525 Market Street, 26th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105-2708
Telephone: (415) 882-5000
Facsimile: (415) 882-0300

Attorneys for Defendant
ENCOMPASS INSURANCE COMPANY

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN JOSE DIVISION

VALENTINA SOLOVIEVA, NATALIA
LITCHEV,

Plaintiffs,

vs.

ENCOMPASS INSURANCE COMPANY,
an Illinois Corporation, and DOES 1 TO 20,

Defendants.

No. C 07-03634 JW

JOINT CASE MANAGEMENT
CONFERENCE STATEMENT AND
PROPOSED ORDER

Pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 26(f) and Civil L.R. 16-9(a), the parties submit this Joint Case Management Statement with respect to the Case Management Conference set for October 22, 2007, and request that the Court adopt it as the Case Management Order.

1. Jurisdiction and Service:

Plaintiffs filed this action in Santa Clara County Superior Court. Encompass Insurance Company (“Encompass”) subsequently removed it to this Court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. sections 1441(a) and 1446. This Court has original jurisdiction over the Superior Court Action under 28 U.S.C. section 1332. Plaintiffs and Encompass are citizens of different states and the amount in controversy exceeds \$75,000, exclusive of interest and costs.

All parties have been served.

2. Facts:

Encompass Insurance Company (“Encompass”) issued an automobile policy to named insured Valentina Solovieva on or about February 28, 2007 (the “Policy”). The Policy insured an automobile owned by Natalia Litchev. Plaintiffs informed the insurance broker of the ownership of the subject vehicle prior to issuance of the policy. In April 2007, Ms. Solovieva was involved in an accident in the named automobile, and submitted a claim to Encompass. Encompass denied the claim on the grounds that Ms. Solovieva did not own or lease the named automobile.

3. Legal Issues:

One or more party contends the following legal issues are in dispute:

1. Whether Ms. Solovieva had an insurable interest in the automobile;
2. Whether Ms. Solovieva is covered by the policy of insurance;
3. Whether Encompass breached the policy;
4. Whether Encompass breached the implied covenant of good faith and fair dealing.

4. Motions:

Following discovery, both Encompass and Plaintiffs intend to move for summary judgment.

5. Amendment of Pleadings:

The parties do not anticipate amending the pleadings at this time. Encompass may file a counterclaim against the broker, VNGO Insurance Services and/or Tony Bereny for contribution and indemnity.

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
525 MARKET STREET, 26TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94105-2708
(415) 882-5000

6. Evidence Preservation:

The parties have taken appropriate steps to ensure the preservation of evidence.

7. Disclosures:

The parties will serve their initial disclosure statements on or before October 22, 2007.

8. Discovery:

The parties plan to conduct discovery regarding all allegations in the complaint. The parties anticipate propounding written discovery and deposing the parties and other relevant witnesses.

The parties do not believe any modification to the Federal Rules is necessary at this time.

9. Related Cases:

There are no currently pending related cases.

10. Relief:

Plaintiff's Statement

Plaintiffs state three causes of action for Breach of Contract, Breach of the Implied Covenant of Good Faith and Fair Dealing, and Declaratory Relief in their Complaint, in relation to the denial of insurance coverage by Encompass. Plaintiffs seek compensatory and consequential damages, along with attorney's fees and costs, emotional distress damages, punitive damages and a judicial declaration of Plaintiffs' rights relative to the policy of insurance at issue.

Defendants' Statement

Encompass is not seeking any relief.

11. Settlement and ADR:

The parties agreed to participate in mediation, and filed an ADR stipulation on October 10, 2007.

12. Consent to Magistrate:

Encompass does not consent to assignment of this action to a Magistrate Judge, and filed its declination on July 31, 2007.

Plaintiffs filed their consent to proceed before a Magistrate Judge on October 10, 2007.

13. Other References:

The parties do not believe any other reference is necessary at this time.

14. Narrowing of Issues:

The parties believe it is premature to narrow the issues through stipulation at this time.

However, as discovery progresses, the parties will re-evaluate this issue.

15. Scheduling:

The parties do not believe this case should be handled on an expedited basis. The parties propose the following schedule for discovery, motions and trial:

Exchange of initial disclosures:	October 22, 2007
Completion of ADR:	January 10, 2008
Expert designation:	May 15, 2008
Rebuttal expert designation:	June 16, 2008
Close of fact discovery:	July 1, 2008
Close of expert discovery:	July 15, 2008
Dispositive motion filing deadline:	July 21, 2008
Dispositive motion hearing deadline:	August 25, 2008
Pretrial Conference Statements filed:	September 8, 2008
Pretrial Conference Date:	September 22, 2008

16. Trial:

The parties request a trial date of October 7, 2008.

17. Disclosure of Non-Party Interested Entities or Persons:

Encompass Insurance Company is not aware of any interested parties required to be disclosed pursuant to Northern District Local Rule 3-16.

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
525 MARKET STREET, 26TH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94105-2708
(415) 882-5000

1 Dated: October 12, 2007

THE PARR LAW GROUP

2
3 By /S/ _____

4 SUJATA REUTER

5 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
6 VALENTINA SOLOVIEVA, NATALIA
LITCHEV

7
8 Dated: October __, 2007

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

9
10
11 By _____

12 KIMBERLY DE HOPE

13 Attorneys for Defendant
14 ENCOMPASS INSURANCE COMPANY

15 **I hereby attest that I have on file all holograph signatures for any signature**
16 **indicated by a “conformed” signature (/S/) within this efiled document.**

17
18
19 ORDER

20 The Case Management Statement and Proposed Order is hereby adopted by the Court as
21 the Case Management Order for the case and the parties are ordered to comply with this Order.

22
23 Dated: _____

24 _____
25 James Ware
26 Judge Of The United States District Court